CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CCD/PV.467
23 April 1970
ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FOUR HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 23 April 1970, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. M. TELLO (Mexico)

(Previous verbatim records in this series appeared under the symbols ENDC/PV.1-ENDC/PV.430).

70-35339

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Argentina:	Mr. C. ORTIZ de ROZAS
	Mr. A.F. DUMONT
	Mr. V.E. BERASATEGUI
Brazil:	Mr. R.E. SARAIVA GUERREIRO
	Mr. C.A. de SOUZA e SILVA
	Mr. L.F. PALMEIRA LAMPREIA
Bulgaria:	Mr. T. PETROV
	Mr. I. PEINIRDJIEV
Burma:	U KYAW MIN
Canada:	Mr. G. IGNATIEFF
	Mr. R.W. CLARK
	Mr. J.R. MORDEN
Czechoslovakia:	Mr. M. VEJVODA
	Mr. J. STRUCKA
Ethiopia:	Mr. A. ZELLEKE
Hungary:	Mr. I. KOMIVES
	Mr. J. PETRAN
	Mr. I. SARKADI
India:	Mr. M.A. HUSAIN
	Mr. K.P. JAIN
Italy:	Mr. R. CARACCIOLO
	Mr. F.L. OTTIERI
Japan:	Mr. I. ABE
	Mr. H. OTSUKA
	Mr. J. SAKAMOTO
	Mr. Y. HAMADA

Mexico:	Mr. M. TELLO
Mongolia:	Mr. M. DUGERSUREN
	Mr. Z. ERENDO
Morocco:	Mr. A.T. BENHIMA
	Mr. M.A.A. KHATTABI
Netherlands:	Mr. H.F. ESCHAUZIER
	Mr. E. BOS
Nigeria:	Alhaji SULE KOLO
	Mr. C.O. HOLLIST
Pakistan:	Mr. K. AHMED
	Mr. S.A.D. BUKHARI
	Mr. T.O. HYDER
Poland:	Mr. W. NATORF
	Mr. K. ZYBYLSKI
	Mr. H. STEPOSZ
	Mr. R. WLAZLO
Romania:	Mr. I. DATCU
	Mr. O. IONESCO
	Mr. V. PARASCHIV
Sweden:	Mrs. A. MYRDAL
	Mr. A. EDELSTAM
	Mr. T. BENGTSON
	Mr. J. LUNDIN
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:	Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN
	Mr. V.V. SHOUSTOV
	Mr. L.A. MASTERKOV
	Mr. V.B. TOULINOV

United Arab Republic:	Mr. O. SIRRY
	Mr. M. ISMAIL
United Kingdom:	Mr. I.F. PORTER
	Mr. W.N. HILLIER-FRY
	Mr. J.T. MASEFIELD
	Mr. R. HOULISTON
United States of America:	Mr. J.F. LEONARD
	Mr. A.R. DAY
	Mr. W. GIVAN
	Mr. W.B. CUTTER
Yugoslavia:	Mr. M. BOZINOVIC
	Mr. M. VUKOVIC
	Mr. S. RASIC
Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General:	Mr. W. EPSTEIN

1. The CHAIRMAN (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I declare open the 467th plenary meeting of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

2. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(translation from Russian): A revised draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof (CCD/269/Rev.2) is today submitted for consideration by the Committee on Disarmament.

3. Discussion of the draft treaty in our Committee and in the General Assembly has convincingly demonstrated that great importance is attached throughout the world to excluding the vast expanse of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, which constitute two-thirds of the earth's surface, from the sphere of the nuclear arms race. The solution of this problem has now become a vital and urgent matter because of the spectacular scientific and technological discoveries which have made it possible to begin the practical exploitation of the sea-bed and the ocean floor. But in addition to the long-term possibilities of using the natural resources of the sea-bed and the ocean floor for the peaceful needs of mankind, a real danger has developed of this environment becoming the scene of a mounting arms race.

4. It is quite obvious that the emplacement by many States of military objects on the sea-bed and the ocean floor would greatly expand the sphere of the arms race and would at the same time create the possibility of local conflicts which might mark the beginning of a global conflict. At present the military use of the sea-bed and ocean floor has not yet been fully developed. But the situation may change in the very near future. Our task is to ensure that the opportunity is not missed, that all the necessary steps are taken to prevent the arms race from spreading to this vast area of our planet. It is easier to stop a process which has not yet begun than to reverse one that is already in progress.

5. The conclusion of a sea-bed treaty will be another important contribution to the solution of the problem of narrowing the scope of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, of curbing it and bringing it to a complete halt. This new international agreement can and must become an important stage towards the next step, which will completely exclude the sea-bed and the ocean floor from the sphere of the arms race. It will help to create more favourable conditions for working out and

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

reaching agreement on further measures designed to bring about the end of the arms race and disarmament. At the same time, the conclusion of such an agreement will be a necessary prerequisite for the development of international co-operation in the peaceful exploitation of the marine environment. It is for this reason that the draft treaty before us assumes such importance, as has been convincingly stated by delegations both in the Committee on Disarmament and in the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session.

6. In resolution 2602 F(XXIV), the General Assembly welcomes the draft sea-bed treaty drafted in this Committee and emphasizes that

> "... the prevention of a nuclear arms race on the sea-bed and the ocean floor serves the interests of maintaining world peace, reducing international tensions and strengthening friendly relations among States" (CCD/275).

The General Assembly calls upon the Committee to complete its work on a draft treaty, taking into account the wishes expressed by States during its twenty-fourth session. As many delegations have pointed out in New York and here in this Committee, the conclusion of a sea-bed treaty is an important matter and work on the draft treaty should not be allowed to drag on over a long period.

7. In its present form, the draft treaty takes account of the wishes and proposals put forward by a large number of States in the Committee on Disarmament and at the last session of the General Assembly, both formally and during informal exchanges of views. We are fully justified in saying that all members of the Committee have taken part in the preparation of the draft treaty and that this document is the result of collective efforts. We hope that this will ensure universal acceptance and broad international support of the draft treaty by all States.

8. As you know, during the preparation of the draft submitted to the Committee on 30 October 1969 (CCD/269/Rev.1), account was taken of proposals made by many States, including proposals on the following questions: participation by the Security Council in the verification of the implementation of the treaty; the convening of periodic conferences to review the operation of the treaty; the procedure for the adoption of amendments to the treaty, etc.

9. During the discussion of the draft treaty at the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly and during the consultations with members of the Committee on Disarmament at the current session, additional suggestions were put forward regarding

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

the inclusion of further amendments and more precise wording in the draft. In the light of these suggestions, the sponsors of the draft treaty, the USSR and the United States, have made a number of changes in the text. These changes relate to four major provisions of the treaty: control over its implementation, the area to which it is applicable, the relationship of the obligations assumed under the treaty to other international obligations of the States parties, and the relationship of the treaty to international agreements concerning the establishment of nuclear-free zones.

10. With regard to the problem of control, it may be pointed out that the draft of 30 October 1969 proposed effective measures for verification of compliance with obligations under the treaty. These measures provided that such verification might be carried out by any State Party using its own means or with the assistance of any other State Party, and that States might refer to the Security Council any controversial matters that might arise during that process. That concept of control found support and sympathy both in this Committee and in the General Assembly. Many delegations, however, suggested that the verification procedure should be worked out more fully and put forward specific proposals to that end. The most detailed exposition of these proposals was contained in the working papers submitted by Canada, Brazil and Mexico.

11. These proposals were taken into account in drafting the amended text of article III we are submitting today. In particular, this article provides not only for observation of the activities of other States Parties on the sea-bed and the ocean floor, but also for an effective investigation procedure, including inspections which may be carried out by agreement between the Parties in cases where serious doubts arise concerning compliance by a given Party to the treaty with the obligations it has assumed. The treaty also specifies that all countries concerned may participate in mutual consultations and verification arrangements.

12. It is highly significant that, under the new version of article III, States Parties undertake, before proceeding to a verification, not only to notify States Parties in the region where the investigation is to take place of their intentions, but also to invite their co-operation in clarifying the situation that has arisen.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

A separate provision of the article, paragraph 6, provides that a verification conducted pursuant to the treaty should be conducted with due regard for the sovereign or exclusive rights of a coastal State with respect to the natural resources of its continental shelf under international law.

13. The detailed verification procedure which has been worked out, coupled with the right accorded by article III to every Party to the treaty to refer to the Security Council the question of the activities of any State on the sea-bed giving rise to serious doubts which have not been removed by consultation and co-operation, constitute a clear, yet flexible system of control over fulfilment of the obligations assumed under the treaty. The article provides that the Security Council may, as a result of its consideration of cases where compliance with the obligations assumed under the treaty has been called into question, take action in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

14. In referring to verification of compliance with the treaty, we realize that cases may arise in practice in which one or other State Party to the treaty, for various political reasons connected with its relations with other countries and the international situation as a whole, will be unable to enter into the consultations provided for in article III of the draft treaty. We therefore think it should be made clear that the consultation among States Parties to the treaty, provided for in article III, paragraph 2, with a view to removing possible doubts regarding compliance with the treaty, is not of course a prerequisite for the exercise by States Parties of their right under paragraph 4 of the same article to refer the matter to the Security Council, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, where there are serious grounds for doing so. Consequently, any State Party to the treaty may apply directly to the Security Council without resorting to consultations.

15. Thus, the proposals made in the statements and working papers of a number of States have been taken into account in preparing the present wording of article III. That is why the text of this article should be regarded as a synthesis of the views and positions of States on the problem of control over compliance with the obligations assumed under the treaty.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

16. Another change made in the draft treaty concerns provisions relating to the definition of the area covered by the treaty, and more particularly the definition of the width of the coastal zone to which the prohibitions of the treaty will not apply. Article I of the former text of the draft treaty defined this zone as: "the maximum contiguous zone provided for in the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone" (article I). Since this Geneva Convention[1/] contains a provision stating that the contiguous zone "may not extend beyond twelve miles from the baseline from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured" (article 24, paragraph 2), the width of the coastal zone referred to in the earlier draft seabed treaty is twelve miles.

17. General agreement was in fact reached in this Committee on the substance of the question of the twelve-mile zone. However, a number of delegations advocated the omission from article I of the draft treaty of the words "the maximum contiguous zone provided for in the 1958 Geneva Convention", beyond which the emplacement of weapons of mass destruction on the seabed and the ocean floor is to be prohibited. It was also suggested that the provisions of article I, paragraph 2 regarding the undertakings of Parties to the treaty should be clarified so that the treaty clearly specified that the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction did not apply either to the twelve-mile seabed zone of the coastal State or to the seabed beneath its territorial waters. It was also pointed out that it would be desirable for article II to state directly that the outer limit of the seabed zone within which the coastal States have special rights is coterminous with the twelve-mile outer limit of the zone referred to in the 1958 Convention.

18. The above proposals were motivated by the fact that a number of countries are not Parties to the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone of 1958, and that the provisions of a sea-bed treaty should therefore be drafted in such a way that accession to the treaty does not affect the position of States with regard to that Convention. Proposals for the corresponding amendments to the wording of the

---

1/ United Nations Treaty Series, vol.516, pp. 205 et.seq.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

article concerning the zone covered by the treaty were made by the representatives of Argentina, the United Arab Republic, Ethiopia, Pakistan and several other countries. As you know, the delegation of Argentina submitted a working paper (A/C.1/997) at the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly, setting out the proposals of a number of non-aligned States in a consolidated form.

19. In order to reconcile the differences of opinion on this question, articles I and II of the draft seabed treaty laid before the Committee today by the Soviet Union and the United States include wording which defines the width of the seabed zone for the purposes of the treaty in accordance with the proposals made by Argentina, and we believe that the amended texts of these articles, as now submitted, will be acceptable to the participants in our negotiations.

20. The third group of changes designed to make the language of the treaty more precise concerns the problem of the relationship between the obligations assumed under this treaty and the position of States with respect to other existing international conventions and with respect to rights or claims related to waters off their coasts including continental shelves. The representatives of a number of States proposed that the provisions of article II, paragraph 2, of the draft treaty of 30 October 1969 should form a separate article. That paragraph of article II provided that nothing in the treaty should be interpreted as supporting or prejudicing the position of any State Party with respect to rights or claims which such State Party may assert, or with respect to recognition or non-recognition of rights or claims asserted by any other State, related to waters off its coasts, or to the seabed and the ocean floor.

21. This proposal has been taken into account and is now reflected in article IV of the revised draft treaty. Moreover, to meet the wish expressed by a number of States, the provisions of this article have been amplified to state that nothing in the treaty shall be interpreted as supporting or prejudicing the position of any State Party with respect to existing international conventions, including the 1958 Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, or with respect to rights or claims related to continental shelves. We attach great importance to this article. In its previous statements, the Soviet delegation has repeatedly emphasized that the provisions of the sea-bed treaty, as is clear from the text, are solely designed to accomplish the purpose this treaty is intended to serve, namely, to prevent the extension to the

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

sea-bed of the race with nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. This treaty is not intended to settle numerous issues of maritime law, to confirm or annul obligations assumed by States under other international agreements, or to anticipate any future solutions in this field.

22. An important addition to the earlier text of the draft sea-bed treaty has been made on the proposal of Mexico and is contained in a new article VIII, which states that the provisions of the treaty shall in no way affect the obligations assumed by States Parties under international instruments establishing zones free from nuclear weapons.

23. These are, in general terms, the changes that have been made in the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

24. We are now entering the final stage of the preparation of the sea-bed treaty. It is our view that all the conditions are now met for the final adoption of the draft treaty. Many delegations have emphasized in their statements that the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor should be completed as soon as possible. Such statements have been made by the representatives of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Japan, Mongolia, Pakistan, Argentina and other countries. Mr. Natorf, the Polish representative has said that the debate on this subject in this Committee

> "has demonstrated a large degree of mutual accommodation and compromise, and that is why we are confident that it will be possible to reach agreement on a draft treaty for the sea-bed in a relatively short time" (CCD/PV.452, para.21).

25. We believe that the way is now open to the successful completion of our long and complex task, the purpose of which was to take a first step towards the complete demilitarization of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof. I trust that the draft treaty on the sea-bed and ocean floor which has been submitted today will meet with the Committee's wide support and approval and that we shall be able to submit it for the consideration of the General Assembly, in accordance with its resolution 2602 F(XXIV).

26. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America): One of the prime requirements for progress in negotiating effective and broadly-acceptable arms control agreements is a spirit of compromise and accommodation among all participants. I think the history of the treaty we are considering today illustrates that such a spirit has prevailed in this negotiation.

27. At the beginning of our spring session last year, the Soviet Union tabled a draft sea-bed treaty (ENDC/240). At the end of that session the United States proposed a very different draft (ENDC/249). Members of the Committee made numerous recommendations for progress on this problem, which were taken into consideration during the long summer session when the United States and Soviet delegations engaged in intensive and at times difficult discussions in an attempt to reach agreement on a single draft that they could present jointly for the consideration of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. At our meeting on 7 October 1969 we were able to announce that we had achieved this objective (CCD/PV.440).

28. From the point of view of the United States, the draft treaty that was tabled on 7 October (CCD/269) was satisfactory as a possible final text. It met what we considered the essential criteria of a sea-bed arms control agreement: it effectively prevented the only arms race we could foresee on the sea-bed; its provisions, in our view, were consistent with existing international law, and it assured compliance with the prohibitions of the treaty without interfering in legitimate sea-bed activities.

29. Some delegations in the Committee on Disarmament made it clear, however, that the 7 October draft did not reflect certain of their concerns with respect to the sea-bed problem. During the remaining weeks of October last year members of this Committee made numerous suggestions for changes in and amendments to the joint draft, and on 30 October the co-sponsors of the treaty presented a revised draft (CCD/269/Rev.1) to the Committee which incorporated several of these proposals.

30. During the twenty-fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly, the 30 October draft was subjected to close scrutiny by the First Committee of the General Assembly. Members of the Committee on Disarmament played a leading role in the discussions in New York. Some delegations developed specific proposals for further treaty amendments to meet their own outstanding concerns and also the concerns of other United Nations delegations. The work in New York, was, we believe, fruitful and worth while. It gave all of us an opportunity to evaluate our progress in the

(Mr. Leonard, United States)

light of the comments of many other countries that had not participated in our work here in Geneva. The final outcome of this activity was a United Nations resolution which welcomed the submission of the draft treaty to the General Assembly and called upon the Committee on Disarmament to continue its work so that the text of a draft treaty could be submitted to the General Assembly for its consideration (General Assembly resolution 2602 F(XXIV); CCD/275).

31. The General Assembly resolution also requested that the Committee on Disarmament take into account the proposals and suggestions made during the twenty-fourth session, and the co-Chairmen, in the negotiations they have carried forward since the beginning of the current session of this Committee, have done so. They have now reached agreement on a second revised draft of the sea-bed treaty (CCD/269/Rev.2). The draft resulting from these negotiations is being circulated this morning, but as a result of the informal consultations conducted during the past week its basic provisions are familiar to members of the Committee.

32. Article I of the new draft is essentially that contained in working paper A/C.1/997 submitted by the delegation of Argentina in the First Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations on 11 December. A few editorial changes have been made at the suggestion of various delegations, but the basic idea of the Argentine amendments, that the concept of a "sea-bed zone" should be used in place of the earlier references to the "maximum contiguous zone provided for in the 1958 Geneva Convention" remains, of course, the essential element of this new draft of article I. This concept is applicable only to this sea-bed treaty and is therefore not related to other legal questions of the law of the sea. The 1958 Geneva Convention is thus utilized in the new article II as an instrument in the solution of the difficult baseline problem. Moreover, the words "the twelve-mile outer limit" are used in article II in order to accommodate the points raised at various times by the delegations of Ethiopia, India, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan and the United Arab Republic about the desirability of including in the treaty such a specific reference to the width of the sea-bed zone.

33. The new article III contains all the suggestions of the working paper (A/C.1/992) submitted by the delegation of Canada on 27 November in New York, except for the references to international procedures and the good offices of the United Nations

(Mr. Leonard, United States)

Secretary-General in paragraphs 3 and 5. There are three changes in the Canadian paper. The phrase "including the freedoms of the high seas", which appeared in the 7 October and 30 October drafts, has been reinserted at the end of paragraph 1. The United States considers the freedom to use the high seas to be an essential element in the effective verification of this treaty. In the last sentence of paragraph 3 the word "Party" has been deleted in the phrase "if the identity of the State Party" since if the State responsible for questionable activities on the sea-bed had not been identified there would be no way of knowing whether that State was a party to the sea-bed treaty. And in paragraph 4 the words "serious question", which appeared in the draft of 30 October, are reinserted in place of the words "reasonable doubt" since we believe this more accurately characterizes grounds for initiating Security Council consideration. The procedures provided for in article III do not, of course, prejudice or limit the right of any State to apply directly to the Security Council in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

34. As recommended by the delegations of India, Morocco, Pakistan and the United Arab Republic, the disclaimer now appears as a separate article. This new article IV is exactly that contained in the Argentine working paper.

35. On 1 December 1969, the delegation of Mexico suggested in the First Committee of the United Nations that the sea-bed treaty include a new article regarding nuclear-free zones (A/C.1/995). The first paragraph proposed by Mexico has been incorporated in the new draft as article VIII.

36. The other articles of the new draft contain minor editorial changes suggested by various delegations here and in New York.

37. I do not propose today to go into a more extensive explanation of the new draft since its key articles are the result of negotiations and consultations with which members of this Committee are already thoroughly acquainted. I look forward to further consultations with members of the Committee concerning any aspects of this draft about which they may have questions.

38. We realize that not all the suggestions and recommendations put forward in this Committee and in New York are to be found in the revised draft. I can say, however, that they have all received very careful study and consideration. One of those recommendations, the draft amendment submitted last year by the representative of Sweden (CCD/271), reflected concern about whether the draft of 7 October went far

(Mr. Leonard, United States)

enough as a commitment to further negotiations on additional measures to prevent an arms race on the se -bed. The United States believes that it did go far enough and that accordingly the present draft also goes far enough. We are firmly convinced that the correct approach to this problem lies in adopting now a measure which is realistic in the light of the present state of technology and verification capabilities and in reviewing this measure later as those capabilities may change. Our commitment to this principle is clearly reflected in the third preambular paragraph and in the provision in article VI for a review conference.

39. I would urge members of this Committee to consider carefully the provisions of article VI. This provides that the treaty will be reviewed with a view to assuring that both: "the purposes of the preamble and the provisions of the treaty are being realized". Thus the charter for the review conference is very broad indeed. It ensures an opportunity to consider the effect of technological or other changes upon the operation of the treaty. And, of course, as I mentioned last October:

> "... if the parties commit themselves to review the treaty after a specified period of time -- that is, five years after its entry into force -- we shall eliminate the possibility that a review might be postponed or delayed indefinitely" (CCD/PV.447, para.20).

40. In fashioning a treaty of this sort I think we must keep in mind that besides the need for compromise and accommodation, which we hope will be a guide for all participants, there is a need at some point to distinguish between what is essential to the basic objectives of the treaty and what may be desirable but not indispensable from the point of view of various States. For if we go too far in attempting to meet all desires we risk losing sight of the fundamental purpose which has led us to take up the task in the first place. We may also find that we are being pressed to accommodate positions which not only raise difficult questions but primarily relate not to arms control but to other issues being dealt with in other contexts. One of our principal concerns in this treaty, of course, has been precisely to avoid affecting issues beyond the scope of arms control.

41. The text as it now stands is not perfect. Every delegation would no doubt be able to draft aspects of it to reflect more adequately the interests and point of view of its own government. The text represents, however, a delicate and, it seems to us, a fair balance among the various interests represented in this Committee and in the international community generally. In getting the treaty ready for submission to the

(Mr. Leonard, United States)

twenty-fifth General Assembly we should consider carefully whether further modifications are necessary if it is to do what it sets out to do, but we should keep in mind that the balance we have achieved can easily be impaired, to the detriment of the common purpose which we all share.

42. The CHAIRMAN (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I believe that I interpret the general sentiment of the Committee by expressing our thanks to the co-Chairmen for the revised draft which they have submitted for our consideration and assuring them at the same time that we shall study it with great attention in order to be able to comment upon its content later.

43. I will now read an announcement on behalf of the co-Chairmen, the text of which is as follows:

"After consulting informally with members of the Committee about the schedule for the sessions of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament this year, the co-Chairmen would like to suggest that the last meeting of our present session be held on Thursday, 30 April, and that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament resume its work on Tuesday, 16 June."

If there are no objections, I shall consider that the proposal of the co-Chairmen is adopted.

It was so decided.

44. The CHAIRMAN (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Accordingly, the Committee will hold its last meeting of this first part of our session on 30 April and will resume its work on 16 June.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament today held its 467th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of Mr. Manuel Tello, representative of Mexico.

"Statements were made by the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, and by the Chairman.

"The delegations of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America submitted a draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof (CCD/269/Rev.2).

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Tuesday, 28 April 1970, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 11.20 a.m.